

Local Levee Assistance Program/ Formerly Local Levee Grant Program - "Comments on Guidelines"

	Agency/Affiliation	By	Date	Signatory	#	Comment	Resolution
1	Legal Counsel for RD 2074	e-mail	4/18/2007	George Hartmann	1	Language excludes all projects in the Delta which excludes San Joaquin County flood management interests from this program	Prop 84 has Delta Money in Chapter 3, Section 75033 \$275 Million for Delta work
2	Reclamation District 1608 <i>(identical wording to RD 2074)</i>	e-mail	4/27/2007	James Bluck	1	Language excludes all projects in the Delta which excludes San Joaquin County flood management interests from this program	Prop 84 has Delta Money in Chapter 3, Section 75033 \$275 Million for Delta work
3	Yolo County	e-mail	4/30/2007	Rick Moore	1	Requests DWR approval of work plan for Huff's Corner levee repair before LLUR program is finalized	As long as eligibility requirements are met, funds will be available as stated in Guidelines, regardless of previous repair projects.
					2	Depth of flooding more critical than other conditions, i.e. velocity?	Criticality language is included in the revised Guidelines.
					3	Will urban and rural areas be scored and weighted equally?	DWR is using economic criteria based on disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged communities (set aside money) regardless of criticality ranking.
					4	Define critical need more broadly	Criticality language is included in the revised Guidelines.
					5	Difficult if not impossible for communities to provide more than minimum cost share	See Note 3 above - (this is why Department is setting aside money for disadvantaged and severely disadvantaged communities. Also, DWR has the subvention program)
4	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	e-mail	4/30/2007	Steven Ross	1	Need more clarification on LOLE Criteria	The FEMA Memo 34 flowchart was used as guidance document for studies; FEMA Memo 43 was used for provisionally accredited levees undergoing study. These changes were incorporated into the Guidelines.
					2	Timelines and environmental document submittal requirements may be difficult/impossible for grantees to fulfill	Guidelines have been changed to accommodate environmental requirements.
5	RD 404 <i>(identical wording to RD 1608 and RD 2074)</i>	e-mail	4/30/2007	Dante John Nomellini, Jr	1	Language excludes all projects in the Delta which excludes San Joaquin County flood management interests from this program	Prop 84 has Delta Money in Chapter 3, Section 75033 \$275 Million for Delta work
6	County of Del Norte	e-mail	4/30/2007	David Finigan	1	Draft guidelines give urban view of what rural means	Local personal income levels taken from census tract data will be compared to the State median income. This comparison will be used to determine whether Del Norte projects can fit the definition of "disadvantaged" or "severely disadvantaged" community as defined in the Guidelines.
					2	50 percent matching requirement excludes Klamath Glenn Levee from consideration	See Above: first Del Norte comment

Local Levee Assistance Program/ Formerly Local Levee Grant Program - "Comments on Guidelines"

	Agency/Affiliation	By	Date	Signatory	#	Comment	Resolution
					3	Guidelines as drafted are contrary to State's commitment to rural areas and do not allow participation by isolated, poor areas populated by minorities and persons on fixed incomes. Therefore, they do not comply with the State's environmental justice policies.	See Above: first Del Norte comment
					4	Recommend modifying the definition of rural and remove match requirement for areas such as Klamath Glenn	See Above: first Del Norte comment
7	Santa Clara Valley Water District	e-mail	4/30/2007	Marc Klemencic	1	Support programs and intend to seek funding	OK
					2	Include Disadvantaged Community considerations	Guideline language will contain set-aside money for disadvantaged/severely disadvantaged communities
8	District 2130	e-mail	5/8/2007	Brian Geary	1	Vehemently oppose opening this program up to the Delta	Agree. Prop 84 has Delta Money in Chapter 3, Section 75033; \$275 Million for Delta work
9	Yolo County Public Works	e-mail	5/10/2007	Rick Moore	1	Very concerned with postponing critical levee repair another year to meet the eligibility requirements of the local levee program	As long as eligibility requirements are met, funds will be available as stated in Guidelines.
					2	Recommend that projects to do critical levee repairs be eligible for the program even though the repairs may have been made prior to the funding program being finalized or agreements signed	Reapply...New Guideline allows for previously paid construction.
10	Riverside County Flood Control	e-mail	5/10/2007	Ken Consaul		need more specifics on the technical requirements	Use FEMA memo 34 flowchart as guidance for studies Use FEMA memo 43 for provisionally accredited levees undergoing study
11	Riverside County Flood Control	meeting	5/9/2007	Mekbib Degaga	1	Time period for soliciting proposals is too short; appear to meet feel good 'solutions'.	Will review timeline in workshop...Also may include timeline discussion in Guidelines, Solicitation Package or other document
					2	Levee definition is vague	Use FEMA memo 34 flowchart as guidance for studies Use FEMA memo 43 for provisionally accredited levees undergoing study
					3	Levee repair standard is not clear. (Minimum requirement should be 44CFR65.10.)	DWR will be reviewing each project case by case, also use FEMA memo 34 flowchart as guidance for studies; Use FEMA memo 43 for provisionally accredited levees undergoing study
12	San Joaquin County	meeting	5/7/2007	Roger Churchwell	1	Program excludes Delta. Why?	Prop 84 has Delta Money in Chapter 3, Section 75033 \$275 Million for Delta work
13	Stanislaus County	meeting	5/7/2007	David Young	1	Please go over review timeline	Will review timeline in workshop...Also may include timeline discussion in Guidelines, Solicitation Package or other document

Local Levee Assistance Program/ Formerly Local Levee Grant Program - "Comments on Guidelines"

	Agency/Affiliation	By	Date	Signatory	#	Comment	Resolution
14	District 2130 Suisun Marsh	meeting	5/7/2007	Brian Geary	1	How are you going to pay for work done before grants are awarded?	Revised Guidelines include provision for work done before award. Construction pre-approval guidelines are new, this will be covered in a workshop slide
					2	Levees broke; if we do the work, will it be reimbursed?	Under emergency provision in Guideline: less CEQA required and they could be eligible. Locate exact citation in Guideline document and put into ppt slide for workshop
15	City of Roseville	meeting	5/7/2007	Garth	1	Need more definition of levee. Does it include other types of water barriers?	Definitions have been clarified in the revised Guidelines.
16	Wood Rodgers, Inc.	meeting	5/7/2007	Jeff Twitchell	1	Is the PSP a one time shot or will it occur again?	For LLUR, yes. For LOLE there will be multiple rounds...\$1 million per applicant
17	Riverside County Flood Control	Email	4/21/2008	Ken Consaul	1	Language in PRC 5096.953	PRC section 5096.955.(a)(2) Evaluations of levees located in the Central Valley that are not part of the State Plan of Flood Control, and that protect an urban area, as defined by subdivision (k) of Section 5096.805. Section 5096.805 (k) "Urban area" means any contiguous area in which more than 10,000 residents are protected by project levees.
18	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works	Email	4/28/2008	David Gonzalez	1	In Section E. Process for Setting Project or Evaluation Priority , and under Significant on page 18, add a fourth bullet that reads: "Internal and external erosions have not occurred due to urban developments induced hydrological and hydraulic (H&H) higher flow. However, engineering analysis and frequent geotechnical deficiencies indicate significant problems due to progressively increasing turbulent inflow into the levee/systems."	Comments noted. Further expansion of definitions not needed. Decision on individual projects will be considered at time of application.
					2	In Table B-1. RATING CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING FACTORS FOR LOLE FUNDING , and under Competitive Criterion on page 41, the following should be added to the second bullet: "FEMA will not accredit the levees due to the underlying hydrological and hydraulic risk criteria, which will continue to cause increased geotechnical deficiencies."	Comments noted. Further expansion of definitions not needed. Decision on individual projects will be considered at time of application.

Local Levee Assistance Program/ Formerly Local Levee Grant Program - "Comments on Guidelines"

	Agency/Affiliation	By	Date	Signatory	#	Comment	Resolution
19	Merced County	Email	4/25/2008	Amber St Claire	1	Merced County requests that the definitions of "Disadvantaged Community" be changed to consider the median income of the whole county where the project is located, rather than just the geographic areas around specific levees. As a mostly rural area, Merced County revenues are not determined by each geographic area, but the County as a whole. The income levels of any one specific location do not always accurately reflect the economic conditions of a county as a whole, or its ability to provide funding for projects. Using County Median Income to determine disadvantaged status would give DWR a more accurate description of the majority of community residents and the need for assistance in that area. Otherwise, larger and more urban counties with access to greater amounts of revenues for matching funds may claim an unfair advantage over those that are more rural.	Comments noted. Data for each project will be determined by location of project, project applicant and information available at time of application